

answer. Maybe somebody who put those two amendments on there to close everything up, maybe they would consider taking them off. I mean, if he says you can have an amendment, well, can we have an amendment by taking down your two amendments and then we will have our amendment? I am sure the answer would be no. Why wouldn't it be? Because they don't want you to offer an amendment, right? That must be it.

I yield the floor.

Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator for giving me time.

MR. SESSIONS. Mr. President, do we have a time agreement now?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time agreement in effect.

LIHEAP

MR. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would just say what an honor it has been to serve with Senator DOMENICI. There is no more effective advocate, no more courageous Senator in terms of speaking the truth about complex matters in words that Americans can understand, and no stronger Senator in committing to a sound economic policy than Senator DOMENICI. We are going to miss him in this body, there is no doubt about it.

I wish to briefly share a few thoughts about the LIHEAP legislation that was offered.

First, I would note that the Democratic leadership has proposed two pieces of legislation at this point in time over the last few weeks that would deal with energy. One is speculation, which I am open to in seeing what we can do to tighten that up, but it produces not one barrel of energy. They also tried to move today a \$2.5 billion energy subsidy to subsidize the purchase of fuel oil for people in America, and they want to spend it. There is no money whatsoever to pay for it, so it is going to be treated as an emergency, adding to the debt this Nation already has. I would just suggest that if you are looking at sound energy policy, it seems to me that Senator ALEXANDER has it right: We should find more and use less.

I would suggest it is crystal clear that the LIHEAP legislation that is designed to use \$2.5 billion of the taxpayers' money—actually, money we don't have because we are already in debt—to subsidize the utilization of more energy—really some of the dirtiest energy we have in America; burning dirty fuel oil in private home furnaces—that is not consistent with a sound energy policy.

So I reject the LIHEAP bill first and foremost because it is unpaid for, it adds another \$2.5 billion to the national debt, and it is on top of an already \$2.5 billion LIHEAP piece of legislation. This is not good leadership from the Democratic side on matters important to America.

You remember the dispute we had over automobile gasoline. The prices

went up, and some suggested we should cut the tax. We said no, that is not good policy. Why would you want to encourage the utilization of more gasoline by cutting this tax? It is just not good policy.

We need to do something fundamental about energy. It is an even worse policy to tax the American people or add debt to our grandchildren to subsidize the utilization of some of the Nation's most dirty energy.

The very people from that area of the country—the Northeast primarily—are the ones who have consistently objected to the production of more energy. Time and time—I have been here 12 years, almost. I know where the votes have come from. The very people pushing for this subsidy to burn more dirty fuel oil are the people who had objected and successfully blocked attempts to produce more, cleaner energy in America, and it is not good.

We need to talk about this. We need to get serious about America's energy policy. I know my fine colleague, the great advocate from Vermont, tried to argue that this is a fair allocation of money and that it is not regionally biased in favor of Vermont or some of our Northeastern States, that it helps rural Southern States with air-conditioning. Well, I am just looking at the numbers in the bills. I have the numbers State by State right here. In Vermont, they have one Congressman. They got \$17 million. I guess that is less than—\$17 million under this program. Alabama, with seven Congressmen—seven times the population—got a total of \$18 million.

Look, this is a gimmick. It is a transfer of wealth to a certain group of people for political reasons, and we are going to send the debt to our grandchildren. It is not good policy.

We ought not to go to the LIHEAP bill because we need to be talking about how to produce more energy. If we produce more energy and we produce cleaner alternative energy sources, if we build nuclear plants that some of these same people have opposed, if we were building another 100 nuclear plants instead of the 100 we have—and we haven't built one in 30 years—if we had been building them the way France has, where 80 percent of their energy is from nuclear power, we wouldn't be in the crisis we are in today, but they blocked that. So I just protest a little bit. Count me as saying no on that question.

I see some of my other colleagues are here, and I yield the floor at this time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 3268

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to speak, but before that, I would like to make a unanimous consent request.

The majority leader said we could offer amendments on energy that dealt

with gas prices. We said we hadn't heard that to be the case for the last 8 days, but we are eager to do that. So I would like to renew, once again, the unanimous consent request that would establish a way in which this Senate on Monday could take up \$4-a-gallon gasoline, with amendments on each side of the aisle and debate them with a limited time agreement and try to come to a result on both the issues of more supply and less demand.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the pending energy speculation measure in the following manner: that the bill be subject to energy-related amendments only; provided further that the amendments be considered in an alternating manner between the two sides of the aisle.

I further ask consent that the bill remain the pending business to the exclusion of all other business other than privileged matters or items that are agreed to jointly by the two leaders.

I further ask consent that the first seven amendments to be offered on this side of the aisle by the Republican leader or his designee be the following: Outer Continental Shelf exploration plus plug-in hybrid cars; No. 2, oil shale plus conservation; No. 3, Alaska energy production plus conservation; No. 4, the Gas Price Reduction Act; No. 5, the clean nuclear energy amendment; No. 6, the coal-to-liquid energy amendment for military aviation fuel, plus the conservation provisions in that amendment; and No. 7, LIHEAP.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Pennsylvania, I object.

MR. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

SENATE PROCEDURE

MR. COBURN. Mr. President, I wanted to spend a few minutes. I have been a Senator for almost 4 years. I think my life experiences I bring to the body are somewhat different than a lot of others. I have some observations on what is happening to us. I hope the American people will pay attention because this week the Senate has failed—miserably failed. We just passed a housing bill that fixes only short-term problems and doesn't fix the long-term problems associated with housing and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. We just did that because we are in a crisis. You have to do it. The Secretary of the Treasury came to the Presiding Officer's conference, he came to ours, and he talked about why this is important for them to have the flexibility to establish confidence in the mortgage markets. We had a great opportunity to not only address that confidence and make sure it was there so people have the proper expectations that they can get a mortgage—and a reasonable one—but we did other things that failed to fix the ultimate problem.

As you play out this bill, if you look at the negative long-run end of it, the